

Crane	Kennedy	Pascarell
Crowley	Kilpatrick	Pickett
Danner	Klink	Riley
Davis (IL)	Kolbe	Sanchez
Delahunt	LaFalce	Shaw
Dickey	Lantos	Shays
Dooley	LaTourette	Shuster
Forbes	Lazio	Snyder
Fowler	Lipinski	Spratt
Frank (MA)	Martinez	Stark
Franks (NJ)	McCollum	Stupak
Gillmor	McInnis	Talent
Gordon	McIntosh	Tancredo
Gutierrez	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)
Hastings (FL)	Meehan	Visclosky
Hefley	Meek (FL)	Watkins
Hilliard	Menendez	Watts (OK)
Hulshof	Metcalfe	Weygand
Hyde	Moran (VA)	Wise
Kanjorski	Murtha	Wynn
Kaptur	Owens	
Kasich	Oxley	

□ 2055

Messrs. CANADY of Florida, ISTOOK and MINGE and Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to instruct was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow for morning hour debate, and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate from Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 119. Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH?

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is a simple question we confront tonight as we have moved in this common sense Congress to reach compromise and consensus in a bipartisan fashion. That is, after agreeing to many provisions on both sides of the aisle, with what some would call reasonable and others would call overly generous spending packages, Mr. Speaker, we are facing this question: How much is enough?

I would turn to the legislation we passed at midweek last week in this 106th Congress, reasonable plans that offered tax relief, but more impor-

tantly, ordered a Medicare refinement and restoration plan needed for our hospitals, needed for our home health care, needed for our nursing homes, and other provisions actually requested by the President of the United States who came to Arizona to embrace a new markets initiative, part and parcel of the bill we passed last week, and yet sadly so many people on the other side voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, how much is enough?

HOW MUCH MORE DOES THE PRESIDENT WANT?

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I think a lot of the American people are surprised that the Congress is still in session. I think a lot of people back in my district cannot believe that we have not resolved our differences. This chart is a little hard to read, but it follows on with what the gentleman from Arizona was talking about. What it shows in red is what the President requested in each of his budget requests per category.

On Education, Labor, HHS, the chart is about the same. Agriculture, right on down the line. In fact, in one of the areas in the Defense budget we are actually giving more than he requested. By the time we are done with this bill that we debated so hotly tonight, at least the motion to instruct, we are going to give the President significantly more than he originally requested, which leads to the real question that not only we in Congress but the American people, and frankly, members of the working press, ought to be asking the President of the United States: How much is enough?

□ 2100

Now, we have been willing to meet with the President to negotiate in good faith. We have met him more than halfway. But we should not be in session today. How much is enough, Mr. President?

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, October 28, 2000, I was unavoidably detained and missed two rollcall votes, Nos. 572 and 573. I would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 572 and "yes" on rollcall No. 573.

CONGRESS FIGHTING BATTLE OVER BUDGET

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here this evening. This

is an historic event. We have never met this late in our legislative season since World War II. But perhaps this is not all bad. We are fighting a battle here, too; and that battle is to keep the budget down.

Over the past few years, when we approached this point, the President demanded more spending. In order to wrap up this session and get home for elections, we capitulated.

This year we are not going to do that. The President is trying to shanghai us by saying, we will only let you go for 24 hours. You have to be here every day, even though there is nothing to do, because they are not negotiating.

I think it is rather unique. But we are here. We are willing to work. We are eager to work. Unfortunately, the President has been out on the West Coast raising money. But as soon as he gets back and as soon as he is willing to negotiate with us, we are ready and willing to negotiate. But we are not going to give the ship away. We are going to restrain the budget and do the best we can to keep the budget balanced.

ISSUE IS NOT HOW MUCH MONEY

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the issue is not how much money. The majority voted last week to increase the caps to \$645 billion in spending. That is \$13 billion more than the President requested. The Blue Dog Democrats suggested a compromise of \$633 billion a long time ago. The majority refused to talk to us.

I hope we will stop talking about money. Money is no longer the issue. Because if we exceed \$645 billion cap for 2001, there will be sequestration and we will bring all the spending back to \$645 billion, which is what the majority has set for the caps, which is way too much spending.

So I hope we will stop this misdirected rhetoric tonight. Because that sign there "how much is enough?" has no relevance whatsoever to any of the issues that we are talking about because we all agree now that \$645 billion is the cap.

PRESIDENT HAS DEMANDED BLANKET AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS

(Mr. ROHRABACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman may or may not be correct in terms of what the issue is. The President always is pushing us to spend a little more on health care, a little